



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

regard Helmer and Nora as the modern Cupid and Psyche. Helmer is the monster, in that his really upright and honorable character is warped and hidden by the ugly veneer of an attitude all too frequent, and outlined thus by Macfall: "Nora must be his toy, his utter slave; pander to all his whims; live only for him; think only what he thinks; believe only what he believes." Nora, the impersonation of Psyche, lives patiently and uncomplainingly in subjection to this idea, until the disclosure of her forgery arouses discord. As the flash of lightning showed to Urvaśi Purūravas, bare of his royal robes, in the Brāhmana version, so the attitude of Helmer toward his wife's blind attempt to aid him discloses him to her unmistakably. Nora realizes at once that separation is necessary and inevitable, and prepares for her departure unmoved by the anger of Helmer. Here Ibsen pauses, and the critics ask impatiently, "Does Nora return?" It may be that the answer is given by the Cupid and Psyche myth. After the tests are successfully passed, and the tasks accomplished, the hero and heroine grow to be finally worthy of each other, and are at last reunited.

IVY KELLERMAN.

Chicago.

GOETHE'S QUOTATION FROM HUTTEN IN *DICHTUNG UND WAHRHEIT*. I.

The extract from Ulrich von Hutten's famous letter to Pirkheimer which Goethe inserted toward the end of the seventeenth book of *Dichtung und Wahrheit* deserves more attention than has hitherto been accorded it. The extract should be read in its entirety to get the full impression of its tone, but, as it would take too much space to print the whole of it, only enough will be cited here to indicate the character of the part to be discussed.

"... es besitzt mich ein heftiger Durst nach dem Ruhm, dass ich so viel als möglich geadelt zu sein wünschte. Es würde schlecht mit mir stehen, teurer Billibald, wenn ich mich schon jetzt für einen Edelmann hielte, ob ich gleich in diesem Rang, dieser Familie, von solchen Eltern geboren worden, wenn ich mich nicht durch

eigenes Bestreben geadelt hätte. Ein so grosses Werk hab' ich im Sinn! ich denke höher! nicht etwa dass ich mich in einen vornehmeren, glänzenden Stand versetzt sehen möchte, sondern anderwärts möchte' ich eine Quelle suchen, aus der ich einen besondern Adel schöpfte und nicht unter die wahnhaften Edelleute gezählt würde, zufrieden mit dem, was ich von meinen Voreltern empfangen. . . . Daher ich denn mit meinen Studien und Bemühungen mich dahin wende und bestrebe, entgegengesetzt in Meinung denenjenigen, die alles das, was ist, für genug achten; denn mir ist nichts dergleichen genug . . . und hier bin ich mit den Männern meines Standes keineswegs übereinkommend, welche Personen eines niedrigen Ursprungs, die sich durch Tüchtigkeit hervorgetan haben, zu schimpfen pflegen, . . . Denn was, bei Gott! heisst es, den beneiden, der das besitzt, was wir vernachlässigten? . . . Ganz rechtmässig hat das Erbteil des Adels, das wir verschmähten, ein jeder Gewandter, Fleissiger, in Besitz nehmen und durch Tätigkeit benutzen können. . . . Mag doch jedem Stand seine eigene Ehre bleiben, ihm eine eigene Zierde gewährt sein! Jene Ahnenbilder will ich nicht verachten, so wenig als die wohl ausgestatteten Stammbäume; aber was auch deren Wert sei, ist nicht unser eigen, wenn wir es nicht durch Verdienste erst eigen machen. . . . Vergebens wird ein fetter und beleibter jener Hausväter die Standbilder seiner Vorfahren dir aufzeigen, indess er selbst untätig eher einem Klotz ähnlich, als dass er jenen, die ihm mit Tüchtigkeit voranleuchten, zu vergleichen wäre." ¹

Before offering any suggestions as to the significance of this letter to Goethe, and its possible reflection in his writings, the field must first be cleared of certain errors that have found acceptance with the commentators on *D. u. W.* For example, it is the accepted opinion that Goethe did not make his own translation from the Latin original, though his failure to name the translator of the passage might lead us to believe he did. It is asserted that he used Wagner's translation, but changed the phraseology rather freely. He is even said to have used a copy of Wagner which he borrowed from the Weimar Library. However, he is neither praised nor blamed for the appropriation.

The following notes concern us here:

Loeper, in the Hempel edition of Goethe, xxiii, 169, says: "Im Anschlusse an seine Beschäfti-

¹ *Werke* (Weimar ed.), xxix, 74 ff.

gung mit der bezeichneten Periode teilt der Verfasser hier einen Auszug aus dem ursprünglich lateinisch abgefassten und gedruckten Briefe Hutten an seinen Nürnberger Freund Pirkheimer vom 25. October 1518 nach einer i. J. 1801 erschienenen Übersetzung mit." In his note on the revision of the text (p. 122), speaking of the spelling of the name Pirkheimer, he says that Wagner spells it Pirkheimer "in *Ulrichs von Hutten Fünf Reden gegen Herzog Ulrich von Württemberg nebst seinem Briefe an Pirkheimer* 1801, welche Übersetzung Goethe 'anmutig benützt hat.'"

Düntzer's *Erläuterungen* (p. 281) has this statement: "Goethe benutzte neben der Urschrift die von der Bibliothek geliehene Übersetzung Wagners." His note in the DNL. edition of *D. u. W.* (xx, 73) runs: "Auf der Weimarschen Bibliothek fand er Wagners 1801 erschienene Übersetzung von *Hutten's Fünf Reden*, denen der Brief an Pirkheimer beigegeben war."

In the Weimar edition of *D. u. W.* (xxix, 223) Baechtold puts it: "Goethe hat im folgenden die deutsche Übersetzung von G. A. Wagner (1801) benutzt, dieselbe jedoch frei umgeschrieben."

R. M. Meyer's note in the Jubilee edition (xxv, 294) reads: "Der hier im Auszug mitgeteilte Brief stammt vom 25. Okt. 1518; Goethe benutzte Wagners 1801 erschienene Übersetzung des lateinischen Originals."

In the edition of the Bibliographic Institute (xiii, 441) Heinemann says: "Am 10. Aug. 1824 u. 22. Dez. 1830 hat Goethe Hutten's Brief aus der Weimarschen Bibliothek entliehen. Er hat die deutsche Übersetzung von Wagner (1801) frei benutzt."

Now all of these assertions with regard to Goethe's use of Wagner's translation are absolutely without foundation. The erroneous opinion that he used Wagner started with Loeper, and is fully accounted for by the latter's misunderstanding of the passage in Böcking, *Ulrichs von Hutten's Schriften* (1859, I, 33*), to which he refers as the authority for his statement. His reference is to that portion of Böcking in which is given a bibliography of the letter to Pirkheimer. Böcking numbers the various titles and gives as No. 6 Münch's edition of Hutten. Number 6a is Wag-

ner's translation. Number 6b reads: "Die Stelle § 73. *med.* bis § 82. a. A. hat Goethe in 'Wahrheit und Dichtung' 17. Buch a. E. anmutig benützt." One's first impression on reading 6b is that Böcking here refers to sections in Wagner. If Loeper had sought to verify the reference he would have found that Wagner's translation is not divided into numbered sections, and that would have led him to question his first impression. Further investigation would have made it clear to him that Böcking means his own critical text (further over in the book), which is divided into numbered sections for convenient reference. Böcking merely says, then: The passage from the middle of § 73 to and including the beginning of § 82, according to the numbering of my text, "hat Goethe . . . anmutig benützt." No implication that Goethe used Wagner's translation. If Böcking had been more consistent and had called his reference to Münch No. 6, that to Wagner No. 7, and that to Goethe No. 8, there would have been no excuse for Loeper's quoting "hat anmutig benützt," as referring to Wagner.

All the other commentators have very naturally looked upon Loeper's statement, seemingly supported by the authority of Böcking, as correct, and thus his error has come to be generally accepted as the truth. Düntzer, not to be outdone by a predecessor, added the other detail, that Goethe used a copy of Wagner which he borrowed from the Weimar Library. That clinched the error; for who would question such a statement? When Baechtold wrote his notes he had before him not only Loeper and Düntzer, but also a copy of Wagner, for he points out a few verbal differences between Goethe and Wagner. He evidently did not question the tradition, though he felt called upon to add: "dieselbe jedoch frei umgeschrieben." Meyer's note gives as much of the tradition as he considered necessary. Heinemann gives evidence of having read Carl Alt's *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Goethes D. u. W.* (1898), where he may have found the dates which he includes in his notes, though he may have secured them from some other quarter.

It was really Alt's duty, considering the nature of his investigations, to verify or contradict Düntzer's assertion that Goethe borrowed Wagner from the Weimar Library, just as it was his duty to

prove or disprove the earlier statement of Loeper that Goethe used Wagner's translation. His failure to make any mention at all of Wagner should have been taken by Heinemann as an indication that Goethe might not have used Wagner.

Let us now investigate the evidence as to whether or not Goethe borrowed Wagner from the Weimar Library.

It is not an arduous task to find out what books he had out of the Library on any particular date. He was given a number of consecutive pages in each new loan book, and the first entries in each were those carried over of all the books and other articles he had not yet returned from former years.

In his diary, under the date of Aug. 10, 1824, we read: "Verschiedene neue Bücher von der Bibliothek." In the Library's loan book for 1824 the only work of Hutten's charged to Goethe is, on the 10th of August: *Equitis Ulrichi de Hutten ad Pirkheimer Epist.* ("Ist für Se. Excellenz geholt worden"). The diary goes on to say that that day and the following day Goethe read Hutten's epistle to Pirkheimer. Feb. 25, 1825, his diary again indicates his study of Hutten. March 24th he returned the book to the Library.

In Dec., 1830, we find the following entries in the *Tagebücher*: 21st.—"Mundum des 4. Bandes *Aus meinem Leben*." (The seventeenth book is in the fourth volume.) 22d.—"Las die Epistel Ulrichs von Hutten bis zur Hälfte." 23.—"Gedachte Epistel durchgelesen." 24th.—"Uebersetzung aus Huttens Epistel an Pirkheimer." 25th.—"Supplirte das gestern Zurückgelassene in Huttens Brief an Pirkheimer."

So he made the translation for *D. u. W.* on the 24th and 25th, and Baechtold's assertion that the end of book seventeen was written in the summer of 1824 (*l. c.*, p. 195) needs revision, as Alt also surmises (p. 74).²

Now the only edition of Hutten's works charged to Goethe at the Library in 1830 is the following, on the 22d of December (the day on which he began to prepare himself for the translation): *v. Huttens Briefe, Latein, 2 Bde.* An examination of the works of Hutten in the Library at that time revealed the fact that "Latein" can be inter-

preted only as meaning Burckhard's edition of 1717, which is the same that Goethe had borrowed and read in 1824 and 1825.³ I have no explanation to offer for Düntzer's erroneous assertion. Goethe returned the books to the Library June 21, 1831.

The loan books of the University of Jena Library have no record of Goethe's having borrowed Wagner there, and Dr. Schüddekopf, who is publishing a catalogue of the books in Goethe's library, assures me that the library contained no copy of Wagner at the time of the poet's death. I find no reference to Wagner in the *Briefe* thus far published or in press, and none in Biedermann's *Gespräche*. Unfortunately we have still to look forward to an index to the *Tagebücher*. There is, therefore, no external evidence that Goethe ever saw a copy of Wagner, unless it be found in some out-of-the-way place in the *Tagebücher* or in some of the unpublished volumes of the *Briefe*. That these will furnish no such evidence seems practically certain from the internal evidence that Goethe did not use Wagner's translation.

The extracts of Wagner's rendering corresponding to those above quoted from *D. u. W.* read: "Dann habe ich einen brennenden Durst nach Ruhm, ich möchte so edel werden als möglich. Nicht ehrlich will ich sein, wenn ich mich für einen edlen Mann halte, weil ich ein Edelmann aus dieser Familie, von diesen Eltern geboren bin, und nicht durch mich es geworden bin. O ich habe etwas weit grösseres vor. Ich denke weiter hinauf; nicht in eine angesehnere Familie zu kommen, sondern anders wo den Quell des Adels aufzusuchen, aus dem ich zur Gnüge schöpfen kann, damit ich nicht blos zu dem eingebildeten Adel gehöre, oder mir mit dem gnügen lasse, was mir meine Ahnen hinterlassen haben. . . . Und darauf wende ich allen Fleiss, alle Mühe, und bin freilich darin verschiedner Meinung von andern, die mit dem vorlieb nehmen, was sie finden. Ich kann das durchaus nicht. . . . Ich denke hierüber nicht wie die meisten meines Standes, die jeden von niedrer Herkunft, der sich durch Verdienste gehoben hat, verachten. . . . Wie töricht ist es aber einen um das zu beneiden, was man selbst vernachlässigte! . . . Es geschieht uns ganz

² An entry in Goethe's diary on Sept. 16, 1831, may mean that on that date he discussed his translation with Riemer.

³ This edition is recommended in the *Mercur*, p. 17.

recht, dass, was wir eigentlich nicht verscherzen sollten, jeder Unverdrossne ergreift und für sich verwendet. . . . Zwar auch eine Geburt aus edlem Stamme hat ihr Rühmliches und Ehrenvolles, und man darf die Ahnen nicht so ganz verachten, diese Stammtafeln ohne weitere eigne Verdienste : nur unser eigen ist das nicht, was wir von dieser erhalten, wenn wir es uns nicht durch eignes Verdienst erwerben. . . . Umsonst zeigt uns ein feister, gemästeter Hausvater die Standbilder seiner Vorfahren, wenn er indessen träge die Hände in den Schoos legt, und eher mit einem Klotz, als mit seinen rühmlichen Vorgängern zu vergleichen wäre." ⁴

A comparison of this version with Goethe's reveals difference rather than similarity wherever there is a possibility for a difference, and if Loeper had not misconstrued Böcking nobody would ever have thought of suggesting that Goethe used Wagner. Let us take three short passages which show clearly that Goethe made his own translation from the Latin.

(1) Burckhard : "me tenet non minima gloriae sitis."

Wagner : "Dann habe ich einen brennenden Durst nach Ruhm."

Goethe : "es besitzt mich ein heftiger Durst nach dem Ruhm."

Düntzer remarks that "es besitzt mich ein Durst" is not German, and his view will hardly be disputed.

(2) Burckhard : "At quae per Christum invidia est, haec habere aliquem, nos quae negleximus?"

Wagner : "Wie töricht ist es aber einen um das zu beneiden, was man selbst vernachlässigte!"

Goethe : "Denn was, bei Gott ! heisst es, den beneiden, der das besitzt, was wir vernachlässigten?"

(3) Burckhard : "Quare frustra pinguem aliquem et crassum ex illis patremfamilias, Maiorum tibi suorum statuas ostentantem, videas, quum ipse desideat interim ; magis trunco similis, quam, ut cum illorum, qui praeluxerunt virtute, conferendus veniat."

Wagner : "Umsonst zeigt uns ein feister gemästeter Hausvater die Standbilder seiner Vor-

fahren, wenn er indessen träge die Hände in den Schoos legt, und eher mit einem Klotz, als mit seinen rühmlichen Vorgängern zu vergleichen wäre."

Goethe : "Vergebens wird ein fetter und beleibter jener Hausväter die Standbilder seiner Vorfahren dir aufzeigen, indess er selbst untätig eher einem Klotz ähnlich, als dass er jenen, die ihm mit Tüchtigkeit voranleuchteten, zu vergleichen wäre."

If Goethe consulted Wagner at all it was to avoid his rendering, even where it was better German than his own.

W. A. COOPER.

Stanford University.

OLD SPANISH LANGUAGE.

R. MENÉNDEZ PIDAL, *Cantar de Mio Cid* : *Texto, Gramática y Vocabulario*. Madrid : Bailly-Baillière é Hijos, 1908. I. 8°, ix + 420 pp.

After a delay of more than a decade, during which it has been recast again and again to accord with the results of the researches made by this or that scholar, Señor Menéndez Pidal's critical and grammatical study of the Old Spanish *Cantar de Mio Cid*, familiarly known as the *Poema del Cid*, has now appeared. With good reason did it receive in 1895 the prize of the Real Academia Española, of which its author has since become one of the most brilliant members. In its revised form the book deserves a hearty welcome. For such sanity and thoroughness of scholarship as it exhibits no praise can be excessive. Hardly any important detail seems to have escaped the notice of the indefatigable Professor of the University of Madrid, who, with this new work, adds one more to the list of his justly lauded publications, among which there stand forth his study of the Legend of the Infantes of Lara, his Old Spanish Grammar, and his editions of the text of the *Cid* and of the first *General Chronicle*.

Naturally, Menéndez Pidal's own edition of the *Cantar de Mio Cid*, as the preliminary to the present volume, furnishes the basis for all his

⁴ Wagner, *Ulrichs von Hutten fünf Reden*, etc., 432 ff.